

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The following Remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed January 21, 2010.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-20, 22-29, and 31-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Reconsideration in light of the Declaration submitted herewith and the Remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

#### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-20, 22-29, and 31-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over United States Publication No. 2005/0091354 to Lowell et al. (hereinafter Lowell) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,698,017 to Adamovits (hereinafter Adamovits).

Reconsideration in light of the remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because, *inter alia*, Lowell does not constitute prior art. Applicants submit herewith a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 wherein the inventors declare that the claimed invention was conceived prior to October 1, 2003, the effective provisional filing date of Lowell. A copy of the Intel Corporation, Invention Disclosure pre-dating the October 1, 2003 filing date is also offered into evidence as Exhibit A in conjunction with the Declaration.

Applicants respectfully submit that because Lowell does not constitute prior art and because the other reference, Adamovits, either alone or in combination, as set forth in the Office Action, does not teach or suggest the limitations of independent claims 1, 10, 19, and 28, that the independent claims are allowable and should be passed to issuance. Further, the dependent claims are allowable for being dependent from allowable base claims.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

***Conclusion***

In view of the remarks made above, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-20, 22-29, and 31-36 are allowable over the prior art of record. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that all the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application. To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 02-2666 and please credit any excess fees to such account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 04/21/2010

By /Eric T. King/  
Eric T. King  
Reg. No. 44,188  
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

Attachments

1279 Oakmead Parkway,  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040